

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 1, 3-5 and 12-14 were amended. Claims 17-18 were added to further define the present invention.

No new matter was added. The limitation of “pausing the commit operation” is disclosed in at least page 15, lines 1-5; page 17, lines 18-21; page 18, lines 1-7; page 26, line 22; page 27, line 5; and page 28, line 11 of the specification. The limitation wherein “one or more transaction steps or transaction operations have been performed for each transaction being paused” is disclosed in at least page 15, line 1; page 25, line 22; page 26, line 22; and page 27, line 5. The limitation in claims 17-18 was recited in the original claims 1 and 4, and is disclosed throughout the specification.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Hicks and Primary Examiner Mofiz for extending the courtesy of a telephone interview in respect to this application on October 5, 2006 with Applicant Bruce Holenstein and Applicants' undersigned representative. During the interview, the contents of the previously filed Amendment were discussed. No agreement was reached regarding the patentability of the claims. However, the Examiner agreed to consider amended language to clarify certain claim limitations. This Supplemental Amendment is being submitted to present such language.

New claim language

Claims 1 and 4 were amended to clarify that when the pausing associated with a commit operation occurs, one or more transaction steps or operations have already been performed, thereby further emphasizing the difference between Son and the claimed invention, as highlighted on pages 9-10 and in footnote 3 on page 11 of the Amendment filed August 7, 2006. Claims 1 and 4 were further amended to clarify that what is performed in step (a) are transaction steps or transaction operations. Claims 1 and 4 were also amended to recite “pausing the commit operation” instead of the more narrow limitation of “pausing prior to a commit operation.” The

“pausing” may occur either prior to a commit operation, or during a commit operation. The previous arguments for patentability are equally pertinent to pausing during a commit operation since there are still transaction steps or operations being performed before it is determined that other nodes or a second node can commit when pausing during a commit operation.

Certain dependent claims were amended to conform to these amendments.

Independent claims 6 and 8

Claims 6 and 8 are believed to be patentable for the same reasons as given in the Amendment filed August 7, 2006. These claims already recite the “transactions steps or transaction operations” limitation in the appropriate location, and thus are not believed to require further amending along these lines. Also, these claims do not recite the same steps (a) and (b) as in claims 1 and 4, and thus it is not believed to be necessary to further define the order of occurrence of steps to distinguish these claims from their respectively applied references.

Regarding claim 6, Applicants wish to highlight the “only” limitation discussed in the previous Amendment.

Regarding claim 8, Applicants wish to highlight the newly added claim limitation, “regardless of whether a commit operation has been performed” as discussed in the paragraph spanning pages 14-15 of the previous Amendment, as well as the other arguments.

Conclusion

Insofar as the Examiner’s rejections were fully addressed, the instant application is in condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowability of all pending claims is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE D. HOLENSTEIN et al.

October 11, 2006 By: Clark Jablon
(Date)

CLARK A. JABLON
Registration No. 35,039
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
One Commerce Square
2005 Market Street - Suite 2200
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7086
Telephone: (215) 965-1200
Direct Dial: (215) 965-1293
Facsimile: (215) 965-1210
E-Mail: cjablon@akingump.com

CAJ:gem